

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-21, 34, 44 and 46-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 and 50 have been amended as shown on pages 2-5 of the Reply. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of April 14, 2008 wherein merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44 and 46-49 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44 and 46-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US Patent 5,555,346), Kelts (US Publication 2001/0030667), Selker (US Patent 6,549,219) and Nielsen (US Patent 6,337,699). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reason. Gross, *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed features.

The claimed subject matter relates to providing an interactive user interface associated with one or more prioritized items that come from various external sources. The priorities are automatically determined by a prioritization system or may be provided by a user. To this end independent claim 1 recites *a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority, the user interface provides feedback about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails, the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the previous e-mails*. Independent claims 34, 44 and 46 recite similar features. Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, either alone or in combination, fail to teach such claimed features.

Gross, *et al.* relates to an event driven and conditional rule based mail messaging system wherein a rule mechanism having a "When-If-Then" condition is implemented. A repertoire of

events considered to be significant events is defined upon which actions in the electronic mail messaging system are triggered. At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Gross *et al.* teaches a user interface that provides feedback about user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails. Applicants' representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the claimed invention, the user interface provides feedback regarding the actions taken by the user on the messages displayed on the user interface. It could be how fast a user responds or reads a selected notification, whether the message is deleted or saved etc. At the cited portions, Gross *et al.* discloses a rule being triggered when a new message comes in, a user taking an action on a message and a timer event or a tickler event being implemented. The rule being triggered is an action being implemented on a message by the user, using a rule editor via the interface. Further at the cited portions, Gross *et al.* discloses a tickler event being implemented. When the tickler event is implemented on a message, the system allows for the message to be moved to the today folder on a date specified by the user, tickle the user for a response on the specified date and conditionally execute a set of rules. However, the ticker event is selected by the user during reading, creating, replying or forwarding the message, and the set of rules for that message are specified by the user via the rules interface (See. Col 10, lines 5-65). Gross *et al.* is silent regarding a feedback provided by the user interface or modifying the set of rules executed for the tickler event, for subsequent messages, based on the feedback. Thus, Gross *et al.* is silent regarding ***a user interface that provides feedback about user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails*** as recited by the subject claims. Further, at page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Gross *et al.* fails to teach ***the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the previous e-mails***. Kelts fails to make up for this deficiency of Gross *et al.*

Kelts relates to retrieving programming information and for generating an interactive navigation interface for displaying such programming information. A navigation interface utilizes a magnification feature along with a hierarchical protocol for the display of active map items and allows a user to make selections. At the cited portions, Kelts discloses displaying categories and subcategories in accordance with a suitable prioritization metric based on frequency of item selected by a user or specific preferences entered by a user or service provider. Further at the cited portions, Kelts refers to a set-top device for a television that works like a general purpose computer to perform *additional software applications such as email applications*. However, Kelts is silent regarding representing emails as objects in a display element let alone prioritizing e-mails. Further, the prioritization scheme as taught by Kelts, although responsive to use patterns or programming changes thus facilitating automatic changes of the navigation map, only teaches applying such changes to existing information within the map and does not teach or suggest applying such changes to new information that is subsequently added to the map. Thus, Kelts is silent regarding *a user interface that provides feedback about user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails and the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the previous e-mails* as recited by the subject claims.

Selker relates to a graphical user interface that includes multiple pie menus concentrically arranged. The menus are arranged with menu selections of greater importance located within the centre most section. The first pie menu comprises a first group of items and the second menu comprises a second group of items. However, Selker does not disclose *the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails* as recited by the subject claims and also fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.* and Kelts. The Examiner cites Nielson to compensate for the deficiencies of Selker.

Nielson relates to a visual presentation of an icon such that a user can visualize and distinguish icons based on their context and can classify them as to importance. However, Nielson is silent regarding *the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails*

as recited by the subject claims and also fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.* and Kelts.

In view of at least the foregoing it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this rejection should be with respect to independent claims 1, 34, 44, 46 and all claims that depend there from.

II. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Neilson, and Knowlton *et al* (US Patent 6,057,842), hereinafter Knowlton. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 15 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Knowlton relates to a visual link mechanism for identifying addresses of locations in a plurality of remote systems and does not remedy aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Neilson, and Simonoff (US Patent 6,078,322). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 19 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Simonoff *et al.*, relates to a virtual machine or device that facilitates interoperability between two or more computers but does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Neilson, and Keller (US Patent 5,767,852) hereinafter Keller. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 50 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or

suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Keller relates to a graphical user interface allowing users to alter the scheduling priority of one or more running processes represented by icons in the display. Keller teaches locking certain icons in place so that they do not move upon other icons being moved to the vicinity. Hence, the position of such icons is procedurally specified by the underlying software as a function of priority and can only be changed by users with special privileges. Moreover, it requires that values be set for each icon in order to lock it in place. In contrast, the claimed subject matter provides a cover for the icons so that they are held in place by a single locking mechanism and it permits a user to easily reset priorities of the system via selection and drag operation. Such a single locking mechanism for all items is not taught or suggested by Keller. Moreover, Keller does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen with respect to independent claim 1 from which claim 50 depends.

Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP248US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731